

Notice of Exempt Solicitation Pursuant to Rule 14a-103

Name of Registrant: Entegris, Inc. (ENTG)

Title: Shareholders Can Vote for 2 Special Shareholder Meeting Proposals

Meeting Date: May 6, 2026

Name of person relying on exemption: John Chevedden, ENTG Shareholder since 2021

Address of persons relying on exemption: POB 2673, Redondo Beach, CA 90278

These written materials are submitted pursuant to Rule 14a-6(g)(1) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. John Chevedden does not beneficially own more than \$5 million of the class of subject securities, and this notice of exempt solicitation is therefore being provided on a voluntary basis.

This is not a solicitation of authority to vote your proxy.

Please DO NOT send me your proxy card; the shareholder is not able to vote your proxies, nor does this communication contemplate such an event.

The shareholder asks all shareholders to vote by following the procedural instructions provided in the proxy materials.



Entegris, Inc. (ENTG) Shareholders Can Vote for Both Special Shareholder Meeting Proposals, Proposals 5 and 6

These proposals are in reverse order because the shareholder Proposal 6 was drafted first and the ENTG Proposal 5 came later.

Proposal 5 is masquerading as giving shareholders a right to call for a special shareholder meeting. With Proposal 5 there are 2 poison pill like barriers that are too challenging and make up the masquerade.

Proposal 6 by contrast is for an attainable shareholder right to call for a special shareholder meeting.

Proposal 5 has 2 barriers that make it a sort of a placebo right for shareholders to call for a special shareholder meeting because history shows that it is unusable.

The first barrier in Proposal 5 is a need for the formal backing of 25% of shares to call for a special shareholder meeting. A 25% requirement is too high because more than 100 companies have initially opposed a shareholder right to call for a special shareholder meeting and not one of these companies have ever cited one example of a special shareholder meeting ever taking place since 1945 where the requirement was 25%.

The second barrier is that Proposal 5 adds a big ball and chain to its 25% requirement by disqualifying a substantial block of ENTG shares from making up the 25% figure. More than 100 companies have initially opposed a shareholder right to call for a special shareholder meeting and not one of these companies have ever cited one example of a special shareholder meeting ever taking place since 1945 where a substantial block of shares were disqualified.

There is no concern that a special shareholder meeting gives a small group of shareholder too much influence because more than a majority vote would be required for approval of the special shareholder meeting topic.

At a special shareholder meeting at least 10% of the vote will automatically be for the management position no matter how outlandish the management position is. Thus it would take at least a 60% vote at a special shareholder meeting for the topic to be approved – a substantial margin of safety.

ENTG Shareholders can vote for both Special Shareholder Meeting Proposals, Proposals 5 and 6.